



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,409	05/03/2004	King-Tung Huang	WISP0052USA	3408
27765	7590	01/03/2005	EXAMINER	
(NAIPC) NORTH AMERICA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE P.O. BOX 506 MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			EDWARDS, ANTHONY Q	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2835		

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/709,409	HUANG ET AL.
	Examiner Anthony Q. Edwards	Art Unit 2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4, 7-15, 17 and 19-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 5, 6, 16 and 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 May 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
      1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

**DETAILED ACTION*****Claim Objections***

Claims 10, 11, 22 and 23 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. The claims recite the same limitations of claims 8, 9, 20 and 21, respectively. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claims 13 and 25 are objected to because of the following informalities: the claims recite the limitation "the fixing devices" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim, since the independent claims recite a single "fixing device," not plural "fixing devices". Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 15, 17, 19, 20, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,517,129 to Chien et al. ("Chien" hereinafter). Referring to claim 1, Chien discloses a folding frame (see Fig. 3) with a rotatable hook (see Fig 10), comprising an upper body (22), a lower body (21), a fixing device (1) disposed on the upper

body (22), a hook (63) rotatably coupled to the lower body (21), wherein the hook is unhooked from the fixing device when the hook is rotated into the lower body and the hook is engaged with the fixing device when the hook is rotated out from the lower body (see col. 6, lines 8-15), and a fastener (6) for rotating the hook opposite to the lower body (see Fig. 10 and the corresponding specification).

Referring to claim 2, Chien discloses a folding frame, wherein the fastener (6) comprises a shaft (62), wherein a first end of the shaft is coupled to the hook (see col. 6, lines 15-18), and a spring (64), wherein a first end of the spring is coupled to a second end of the shaft (see Figs. 10 and 11).

Referring to claim 3, Chien discloses a folding frame, wherein the fastener (6) comprises a latch pin (not numbered) capable of moving the spring thereby moving the shaft for rotating the hook. See Fig. 11, wherein the “latch pin” is capable of moving the spring (64), since the spring is wound about the latch pin and potential energy is stored in the spring to move the spring about the latch pin.

Referring to claim 4, Chien discloses a folding frame, wherein a first end of the latch pin is coupled to a second end of the spring (see Fig. 11) and a second end of the latch pin is exposed outside the lower body (see Fig. 14).

Referring to claim 7, Chien discloses a folding frame, wherein the fixing device (1) comprises a magnet (415), and the hook (63) comprises a magnetic metal. See Fig. 4 and col. 6, lines 14-15.

Referring to claims 8 and 10, Chien discloses a folding frame, wherein the upper body is a display module and the lower body is a system module. See Fig. 3 and the corresponding specification.

Referring to claim 12, Chien discloses a folding frame, wherein the frame is notebook computer. See Fig. 3 and the corresponding specification.

Referring to claim 15, Chien discloses a folding frame (see Fig. 3) with a rotatable hook (see Fig 10), comprising an upper body (22), a lower body (21), a fixing device (1) disposed on the upper body (22), a hook (63) rotatably coupled to the lower body (21), wherein the hook is unhooked from the fixing device when the hook is rotated into the lower body and the hook is engaged with the fixing device when the hook is rotated out from the lower body (see col. 6, lines 8-15), and a fastener (6) for rotating the hook (63) opposite to the lower body (see Fig. 10 and the corresponding specification) comprising a spring, wherein a first end (not numbered) of the spring is coupled to the hook, and a latch pin (not numbered), capable of moving the spring thereby rotating the hook, wherein a first end of the latch pin is coupled to a second end of the spring. See Fig. 11, wherein the “latch pin” is capable of moving the spring (64), since the spring is wound about the latch pin and potential energy is stored in the spring to move the spring about the latch pin.

Referring to claim 17, Chien discloses a folding frame, wherein the second end of the latch pin is exposed outside the lower body (see Fig. 14).

Referring to claim 19, Chien discloses a folding frame, wherein the fixing device (1) comprises a magnet (415), and the hook (63) comprises a magnetic metal. See Fig. 4 and col. 6, lines 14-15.

Referring to claims 20 and 22, Chien discloses a folding frame, wherein the upper body is a display module and the lower body is a system module. See Fig. 3 and the corresponding specification.

Referring to claim 24, Chien discloses a folding frame, wherein the frame is notebook computer. See Fig. 3 and the corresponding specification.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9, 11, 13, 14, 21, 23, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chien in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,628,509 to Kono. Referring to claims 9, 11, 21 and 23, the portable computer of Chien inherently teaches the system module comprising a central processing unit, a memory module and a bus interface for receiving and/or outputting signals from/to another system. Chien does not teach the system module including a wireless module for transmitting signals wirelessly. Kono teaches providing a system module (see Fig. 6 and the corresponding specification) with a wireless module for transmitting signals wirelessly.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the system module of Chien with a wireless module, as taught by Kono, since the device of Kono would allow for the utilization of wireless technology that is commonplace in today's computer systems.

Referring to claims 13 and 25, as best understood by the Examiner, Chien discloses a portable PC (2), wherein the upper body (22) is a display module, the upper body connected (*sic*) to the lower body (21) rotatably and with the fixing devices (1) set on both sides. See Fig. 4 and col. 6, lines 30-39. Chien does not teach the display module comprising a touch panel. Kono teaches providing a portable PC (1), wherein the display (2) comprises a touch panel (see Fig. 10 and the corresponding specification).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the display module of Chien to include a touch panel, as taught by Kono, since the device of Kono would provide the portable PC of Chien with a greater variety of data input methods, i.e., stylus pen units, etc.

Referring to claims 14 and 26, Chen discloses the folding frame as claimed, except for the device being an electronic translator. Kono teaches providing folding frame for an electronic device, including an electronic translator. See Fig. 8 and the corresponding specification.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify device of Chien to include an electronic translator, as taught by Kono, since the device of Kono would allow the device of Chien to be during trips to foreign countries to translate words and/or calculate foreign currency equivalents.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 5, 6, 16 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of

allowable subject matter: referring to claims 5 and 18, the specific limitation of the second end of the latch pin being connected to a knob, wherein the hook is rotated forward when the knob is moved, in combination with the rest of the elements or steps, is not taught or suggested by the prior art references.

Referring to claims 6 and 16, the specific limitation of the folding frame further comprising a slit, wherein the fastener slides along the slit for rotating the hook, in combination with the rest of the elements or steps, is not taught or suggested by the prior art references.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: U.S. Patent No. 6,659,516 to Wang et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,125,040 to Nobuchi et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Q. Edwards whose telephone number is 571-272-2042. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-3:00) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn D. Feild can be reached on 571-272-2800, ext. 35. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

December 21, 2004

aqe



**ANATOLY VORTMAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**